

### **REMARKS**

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 12 in view of the above amendments and the following arguments.

### **THE OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 9 AND 10**

The Examiner objected to Claims 9 and 10 on the basis that "Claim 10 does not appear to further limit the special technical features as disclosed in Claim 9." The Applicants traverse these objections.

Although Claims 9 and 10 are similar, there are distinct differences that result in different claimed subject matter. Claim 9 requires that the data representative of the different electronic ticket is printed on a different player ticket whereas Claim 10 requires that the data is printed on the same player ticket introduced in independent Claim 6.

Due to the differences between the claims, the Applicants submit that Claims 9 and 10 are not objectionable under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).

### **THE SECTION 112 REJECTIONS**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to provide antecedent basis for "the ticket record storage device." The above amendment to Claim 1 corrects the typographical error in the original claim that prompted the Section 112 rejection. In particular, Claim one is corrected above to refer to "the ticket record manufacturing device." The Applicants submit that this correction obviates the Section 112 rejections.

**THE CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED OR OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF WALKER**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 4-12 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,024,640 to Walker et al. (the "Walker Patent" or "Walker"), and rejected Claim 5 as being obvious in view of the Walker Patent. The Applicants believe that the claims as amended are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Walker Patent.

The Walker Patent discloses a system in which a player purchases a number of predetermined game outcomes at a retail location and receives a hard copy receipt or data carrier containing the purchased outcomes. The player may then input data from the receipt or smart card at a remote player terminal to reveal the outcomes.

The Examiner likened the receipt printer or smart card writer at the retail location as the manufacturing device required in element (b) of Applicants' Claim 1, and likened the receipt printing or smart card writing in Walker to the step of producing a game set record as required in element (b) of Applicants' Claim 6. Claim 1 is amended above to clarify that the ticket record manufacturing device is at a secure location inaccessible to players. Claim 6 is amended to clarify that the game set record is produced at a secure location and secured from player access. In contrast, Walker does not teach or suggest producing a game set record separate from the outcome data stream itself and maintaining the game set record at a secure location, inaccessible to players. For this reason, the Applicants submit that Claims 1 and 6 are anticipated or obvious over the Walker Patent and are entitled to allowance together with their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 12.

If the Examiner should feel that any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or that a conference might expedite allowance of the claims, he is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.

Date: 23 April 2003

By: 

Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124  
J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr., Reg. No. 29,858  
1250 Capital of Texas Hwy. South  
Building One, Suite 360  
Austin, Texas 78746  
512-327-8932 voice  
512-327-2665 fax  
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Fax No. 703-872-9302) on April 23, 2003.

Reg. No. 32,124, Russell D. Culbertson 